

REMARKS

First, I want to thank Examiner Siddiqi for his time and consideration of this application during our telephone conference yesterday.

Examiner Siddiqi maintains his belief that *Krishnaswamy* delays asynchronous exception handling like the applicant's invention does. The applicant still maintains that his mechanism for handling asynchronous exception alone is patentably different from *Krishnaswamy's*, since the applicant's solution provides a precise guarantee of when each asynchronous exception will be handled, without the need for GAR points. Nonetheless, the applicant wishes to expedite prosecution of this application, while still reserving the right to seek protection for his mechanism for handling asynchronous exceptions alone in future continuing applications.

The Examiner observed that neither *Krishnaswamy* nor the previously cited prior art has any teaching of how to deal with *synchronous* exceptions, especially of different types. This is so.

In this draft amendment, Claims 1 and 16 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 5 and 19, respectively, which relate to how the invention determines the presence of and then handles both types of *synchronous* exceptions. Other claims that then become redundant have been canceled and the dependency of certain dependent claims has been changed to be consistent with the new base claims. Claim 15 already had the limitations relating to synchronous exception handling.


The claims presented in this amendment take into account the Examiner's comments, and should now be allowable.

Thank you.

Date: 22 November 2004

34825 Sultan-Startup Rd.
Sultan, WA 98294
Phone & fax: (360) 793-6687

Respectfully submitted,


Jeffrey Pearce
Reg. No. 34,729
Attorney for the Applicant

Serial No. 09/592,368
Art Unit: 2154

Page 11 of 11

Docket: VMware5

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.